

REMARKS

This response is made at the recommendation of Supervisory Primary Examiner Sough because the Office Action on May 2, 2006 is a duplicate of the Office Action received on January 13, 2006, which Applicants' believe was sent in error.

Applicants belief that the present Office Action is a duplicate Office Action is supported by the fact that the present Office Action does not address Applicants' arguments, for example, as quoted from paragraph 4 of the present Office Action on page 7, "Applicants arguments filed on April 4, 2005 have been fully considered, but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection." However, the new grounds of rejection is the same rejection as the rejection in the Office Action dated January 13, 2006 and the Examiner refers to Applicants' April 4, 2005 Response in the arguments when, in fact, a Response was filed April 13, 2006.

Applicants respectfully request an Office Action responsive to Applicants' arguments of the Response dated April 13, 2006.

It is respectfully asserted that claims 28-59 are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is respectfully requested based on Applicants' arguments submitted on April 13, 2006.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application, or should the Examiner believe a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: June 28, 2006

By:



Martin E. Miller

Registration No. 56,022

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620